

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Nakamura et al., JP 10290443. Nakamura does not teach all the limitations of amended claim 2. More specifically, Nakamura does not teach “where said charge amount is further adjusted if said additional information is recommended to another.” Referring to paragraph [0007] of the English translation of Nakamura, Nakamura discloses a video on demand system where an advertising image is added to the contents and sent to a contractor terminal. If the contents are reproduced the authentication information on the advertising image is extracted and is compared with the advertising image authentication information registered with the contractor. Depending on the compared result an accounting is performed or playback of the contents is performed. Nakamura, however, is silent in regards to further adjusting the charge amount if the advertisement is recommended to another. Thus, Nakamura does not teach further adjusting the charge amount if the additional information is recommended to another. Therefore, Nakamura does not teach all the limitations of amended claim 2.

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Abecassis U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,178. Abecassis does not teach all the limitations of amended claim 2. More specifically, Abecassis does not teach “where said charge amount is further adjusted if said additional information is recommended to another.” Referring to the abstract of Abecassis, Abecassis discloses a video delivery system where the viewer is compensated for viewing an

advertisement that accompanies the video. Further, referring to column 36, lines 17–41, Abecassis further discloses that the user may transmit “video” to another user. Abecassis, however, is silent in regards to further adjusting the charge amount if the user recommends the advertisement to another. Thus, Abecassis does not teach further adjusting the charge amount if the additional information is recommended to another. Therefore, Abecassis does not teach all the limitations of amended claim 2.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33157.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Michael W. Garvey – Reg. No. 35,878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: November 29, 2005